

Miller, George	Ruppersberger	Stark
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Strickland
Moore (WI)	Sabo	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Salazar	Tanner
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda	Tauscher
Napolitano	T.	Taylor (MS)
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)
Oberstar	Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Obey	Saxton	Tierney
Oliver	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Owens	Schiff	Udall (NM)
Pallone	Schwartz (PA)	Van Hollen
Pascarell	Schwarz (MI)	Wamp
Pastor	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Paul	Serrano	Schultz
Payne	Shays	Waters
Pelosi	Sherman	Watson
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Watt
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Weiner
Rothman	Snyder	Wexler
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Woolsey
Royce	Spratt	Wu

NOT VOTING—3

Kelly	Sessions	Velázquez
-------	----------	-----------

□ 1644

Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 748, THE CHILD INTERSTATE ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet next week to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act, which I suspect will be discussed by my friends, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), in just a moment.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H-312 of the Capitol by noon on Tuesday, April 26, 2005. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary by April 13, 2005. Members are advised that the report of the Committee on the Judiciary was filed today, and Members are also advised that the text of the reported bill should be available for their review on the Web sites of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules by Friday, April 22, 2005.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring about the schedule for the coming week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Tuesday at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules, and a final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes called on these measures will be rolled until 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will convene at 10 a.m. for legislative business. We may consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules, as well as H.R. 748, the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the distinguished whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Mr. Leader, I noticed that the budget conference report is not listed on the schedule next week. The gentleman and I talked about that last week. Can the gentleman tell us when the gentleman believes the budget conference will be appointed and when we might have that on the floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I believe the Committee on the Budget chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), has had some informal discussions with his Senate counterpart. I have spoken to the majority leader of the Senate. They are hoping to call a conference committee meeting sometime next week, which means we will have to go to conference sometime next week. As the gentleman may or may not know, the Senate is taking a work period the following week, so they are trying as hard as they can to get this conference formed, a meeting, and work done so that we can have a conference report on the floor of the House and the Senate by the end of next week.

□ 1645

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information. If I could raise one additional issue, it is my understanding that one of the reasons we have not appointed conferees and we have not gone to conference is the issue of the Medicaid cuts.

I understand a substantial number of Members on your side have suggested that those cuts are not advisable. Obviously, the Senate did not include those cuts. Can the majority leader tell me at this point in time if there has been any resolution of this issue, as to where we might stand on those Medicaid cuts.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. All I can tell the gentleman is, I know there is a lot of discussion about that over in the Senate. I do not know what their reso-

lution is, even if there is a resolution on the Senate side.

The House, as the gentleman knows, passed the budget that has substantial mandatory savings in it. The House is very interested in holding the line on their mandatory savings, and the Senate is trying to work through this process.

So it is really up to the Senate as to what they are going to bring to the conference.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for that information. Again, I do not know the accuracy of the letter in terms of the numbers of people, but there seemed to be a fair number of people, there were over 40, on the letter which appeared to agree with the Senate's view, obviously a large number on this side who share that view as well.

Perhaps we might have some discussions about reaching agreement on that issue at some point in time.

Mr. DELAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am sure that the discussions will fly fast and furious over next week in trying to get this conference report done.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his information, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 25, 2005, AND HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, APRIL 26, 2005.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next, and, further, that when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 26, 2005 for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1095

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1095, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish and provide a checkoff for a World Trade Center Memorial Fund, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it may come as a surprise to the minority leader and her liberal followers in this Chamber to learn that when I am back in the 4th District of Kentucky I am not asked why I support the majority leader. I am asked why the liberal Democrats insist on obstructing progress in the House.

My constituents want to know why the so-called progressive party opposes legislation to create jobs, to lower the cost of health care, to secure our borders, to fortify our military and to strengthen Social Security for future generations. And now my constituents want to know why the liberal Democrats will not let the majority leader appear before the ethics committee to clear his name.

It appears to my constituents that the liberals are afraid the majority leader, a man who does not stand in violation of any law, will clear his name. And then what happens? The minority leader and her followers will have to explain why they wasted America's time assassinating the character of the majority leader rather than working in Congress to help our country.

I think the answer is already clear.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 weeks, Democratic leaders have been speaking out of both sides of their mouths. They have leveled charges against the majority leader, yet at the same time they will not allow the ethics committee to convene and explore the facts. If they are serious about our ethics process in this institution, why will they not let the ethics committee organize so that it can conduct its business?

Time and time again the ethics committee chairman has offered to end the Democratic logjam. This is the same old, tired, petty, partisan politics of the past. A Democrat leader is quoted as saying this issue will cost Republican seats in next year's election, petty, partisan politics.

There is only one conclusion that can be drawn from the activities of the Democrat leaders, they would rather have an issue than a solution. It is sad and it is cynical.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to an open, fair and expedient ethics process and are willing to work with Democrats productively. I challenge all Members of this body to ask their leaders to act responsibly.

Let us allow the ethics committee to proceed with their appropriate work. Stop the petty, partisan, political tactics. Let us work together and honor our constituents' trust.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of complaints about rules changes by Democrats. As a freshman, as a former judge and chief justice, I am still in the process of making assessments. When I hear allegations for or against either side, I am looking to figure out, is there evidence to support or dispel the allegations.

In this case, the allegations about the rules changes, you have to take a look at. In the first place, there have been ethical allegations made about the majority leader, Mr. DELAY, and the complaint about the rules changes.

Well, we look at the rules. First of all, allowing someone to know what they are charged with in advance seems pretty reasonable. Allowing someone to hire their own attorney sounds pretty reasonable. Going from 90 days to 45 days seemed a little short, and then we hear Chairman HASTINGS say, We will go and I will give you an automatic extension back to 90.

You look at the evidence, the fact that there was a RICO lawsuit filed against the majority leader that was dismissed with prejudice because there was nothing there, you have a DA that has been trying to indict him for years unsuccessfully.

There is an old saying, Mr. Speaker, justice delayed is justice denied. It appears now that this is all about denying justice to DELAY.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 weeks Democrats have attacked the character, leadership and intentions of the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Although Democrats continue to smear the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), they forget that they are responsible for preventing the ethics committee from investigating the charges directed at the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Since the beginning of the 109th Congress, House Democrats have refused to allow the ethics committee to meet to address this issue. Four ethics committee Republicans have pledged that as soon as the Democrats permit the ethics committee to function again, they will vote to form an investigative subcommittee to review various allega-

tions concerning travel and other actions by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Majority Leader DELAY has said all along that he wants to appear before the ethics committee to address the recent accusations. Unfortunately, Democrats prefer to attack his character for political purposes rather than officially investigate these allegations.

Democrats should stop playing politics with the House ethics committee and should give the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) the opportunity to defend himself through the congressional ethics process.

In conclusion, God bless our troops. We will never forget September the 11.

SUPPORT FOR THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, we are now 4 months into the 109th Congress and Republicans have passed bankruptcy reform, repealed the death tax, adjusted class action lawsuits to help victims, enacted border security to keep out terrorists, passed a budget and wartime funding, strengthened job training for millions and passed the highway bill. Meanwhile, the House Democrats have not proposed an agenda, but instead have remained negative, obstructive and focused on partisan attacks.

I rise today to support the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), not because he has proven to be an effective leader, but because he has been a victim of political game-playing and a relentless media, a media not focused on policies that have helped millions of Americans lead better lives, but instead focused on tabloid attacks on our leader.

Time and time again, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has requested to appear in front of the ethics committee. He has requested this opportunity to prove his innocence and put an end to these meritless accusations, accusations that are based upon nothing but pure partisan rhetoric.

Democrats' attack on the Republican majority leader is nothing but a coordinated agenda to stop an effective leader from accomplishing the people's business.

Ethics is an issue that should not be taken lightly. The committee in Congress should not be used as a partisan tool. We need to get back to debating the principles to make America a better place.

IN SUPPORT OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

(Mr. HERGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend from Washington, and the gentleman from Washington